

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed November 15, 2011, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. By means of the present amendment, independent claims 1, 95, 132 and 139 have been amended for better clarity and to include the features of canceled claims 26 and 31. Entry of the present amendment and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20, 22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-38 and 95-144 are pending in the application, where claims 21, 23, 39-40, 61 and 63 had been previously canceled without prejudice, and claims 26, 31, 41-60, 62 and 64-94 have been currently canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 95, 130 and 137 are independent.

In the Final Office Action, claims 34 and 41-93 are objected to for certain informalities. In response, the claims been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions including deleting claims 41-94 and re-introducing (except for claims 65 and 70) as new claim 95-144. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to claims 34 and 41-93 has been overcome and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-20, 22, 24-38, 41-59, 61 and 63-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,819,092 (Ferguson) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,329 (Smith). This rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that the claims are patentable over Ferguson and Smith for at least the following reasons.

Ferguson is directed to an online service development tool with fee setting capabilities. On page 8 of the Office Action, in rejecting claims 21 and 23, column 37, lines 1-5 and column 37, lines 18-23 of Ferguson are cited. In particular, column 37, lines 1-5 of Ferguson specifically recite (emphasis added):

UserTotalAccessSize%(<user\_num>)

Returns the **total size of the files** that have ever been accessed by the user whose user identifier is <user\_num>. The User Total Access Size Function is useful for computing quantity discounts.

Further, column 36, lines 18-23 of Ferguson specifically recite (emphasis added):

ProviderFilePath\$(<provider\_num>, <index>)

Returns the **path** of the file at index <index> in the list of files associated with the content provider whose provider identifier is <provider\_num>. The allowable range of <index> is 1 through ProviderFileCount%(<provider-num>), inclusive.

As correctly noted on page 4 of the Final Office Action, Ferguson does not disclose or suggest "indicating, for each video-enhanced page in a hypervideo application, information regarding previous video-enhanced pages users viewed before a current video-enhanced page and from which the users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page; and indicating information regarding next video-enhanced pages to which the users proceeded from the current video-enhanced page," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 95, 130 and 137. Smith is cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in Ferguson.

Smith is directed to a method of maintaining search results pages, where "FIG. 6

illustrates a sequence of steps employed by the preferred embodiment of the present invention to add entries to the page index." (Smith, column 4, lines 1-3; emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that Ferguson, Smith, and combination thereof, do not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 95, 130 and 137 which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

simultaneously displaying on a display the information regarding the previous video-enhanced pages, a list of media contained in the current video-enhanced page, and the information regarding the next video-enhanced pages, ...

wherein the information regarding the previous video-enhanced pages comprises percentage of total times when viewing the previous video-enhanced pages that users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page, and

wherein the information regarding the next video-enhanced pages further comprises percentage of total views of the current video-enhanced page that result in a user proceeding to each of the next video-enhanced pages.

Simultaneously displaying on a display information regarding the previous video-enhanced pages, a list of media contained in the current video-enhanced page, and the information regarding the next video-enhanced pages, is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Ferguson and Smith, alone or in combination. Rather, Ferguson merely discloses or suggests commands that individually, and not simultaneously, provide the total size of user accessed files and the path of the files, and Smith merely discloses a sequence of steps related to adding entries to the page index. Even if the Smith sequence of steps are displayed simultaneously, such a sequence of steps is not information that include

percentage of total times when viewing the previous video-enhanced pages that users proceeded to the current video-enhanced page, and percentage of total views of the current video-enhanced page that result in a user proceeding to each of the next video-enhanced pages.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1, 95, 130 and 137 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1, 95, 130 and 137, as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, Applicants reserve the right to submits further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
February 10, 2012

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101